UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,640	06/30/2003	Arno Mechler	089442-000000US	1388

20350 7590 10/04/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
WILLIAMS, DON J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2878	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

EK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/611,640	MECHLER, ARNO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Don Williams	2878	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 July 2002*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *18-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *18-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the Applicant's application filed on July 1, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-20, 22-25, 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer et al in view of Hirabayashi et al (5,920,644).

As to claim 18, Kramer et al disclose a detection system comprising a plurality of detector units (110), (112), (114), (116), light transmitters (30), light receivers (32), optical connection paths (50), (52), (54), (56), (58), optical anomalies (64), (66), (68) and control circuit (FireWall System) connected to the light transmitters and light receiver, (see fig. 1, fig. 2, fig. 4, fig. 5, column 2, lines 24-67, column 3, lines 18). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art to modify Kramer et al to include a sensor (16-4) as disclosed by Hirabayashi et al to improve and detect the electrical response corresponding to the position of the monitor beam detected by the position sensor (16-4), (see fig. 16, column 16, lines 36-45)

As to claim 19, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with optical connection paths formed by light conductors (50), (52), (54), (56), (58) and by reflecting passages, (64), (66), and 68), (see fig.5, column 3, line 1-18, fig. 6, column 4, lines 2-23).

As to claim 20, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with optical connection paths (50), (52), (54), (56), and (58) extend in a straight line within each detector units (22), (23), (24), (25) and (26), (see fig. 4, column 2, lines 52-63).

As to claim 22, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with optical anomalies (64), (66), and (68) have total reflecting recesses of the optical connection paths (50), (52), (54), (56), and one or more partly transmitting reflection element, (see fig. 5, column 3, lines 1-17, fig. 6, column 4, 1-23).

As to claim 23, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with a single light transmitter (30) for coupling light from the light transmitter (30) into the optical connection paths (50), (52), (54), (56), (58) and a single light receiver (32) for receiving light from the optical connection paths (50), (52), (54), (56), and (58), (see fig. 2, column 2, lines 23-51, fig. 5, column 3, lines 1-17).

As to claim 24, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with optical interfaces, optical anomaly (64), light transmitter (30) and light receiver (32) are arranged such that both optical interfaces are optically connected and each of the optical interfaces are optically connected to the light transmitter (30) and to the light receiver (32), (see fig. 9, column 5, lines 6-14).

As to claim 25, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with light transmitter (30) and light receiver (32) comprises a transceiver element, (see fig. 4, column 2, lines 52-62).

As to claim 26, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with two optical connection paths (50), (52), (54), (56), (58) and two optical interfaces are connected

with the light transmitter (30), and associated optical anomalys (64) arranged at optical connection paths (50), (52), (54), (56) (58), and a light receiver (32) connected with another associated optical anomaly (64) arranged at optical connection paths, (see fig. 5, column 3, lines 1-18, fig. 6, column 4, lines 1-23).

As to claim 27, Kramer et al disclose optical interfaces. Kramer et al fail to disclose a sensor. Hirabayashi et al disclose a sensor. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art to modify Kramer et al to include a sensor (16-5) as disclosed by Hirabayashi et al to improve and detect the electrical response corresponding to the position of the monitor beam detected by the position sensor (16-4), (see fig. 16, column 16, lines 36-45)

As to claim 28, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with optical interfaces of adjacent detector units (22), (23), (24), (25), and (26) are provided in a congruent arrangement, (see fig. 1, column 2, lines 24-35).

As to claim 30, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with terminal units having a terminal reflector (158) in a congruent arrangement to the optical interface and adjacent detector units (152), (see fig. 12, column 5, lines 37-60).

As to claim 31, Kramer et al disclose terminal unit (158) having first and second optical interfaces and optical connection paths (50), (52), (54), (56) and (58) connecting the first and second optical interfaces, the first and second optical interfaces being arranged congruently to the optical interfaces of adjacent detector units (22), (23), (24), (25) and (26), (see fig. 1, column 31-46, fig. 5, column 3, lines 1-18).

As to claim 32, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with a control unit (FireWall System), (see column 6, lines 50-67, column 7, lines 1-45).

As to claim 33, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with optical connection paths (50), (52), (54), (56), and (58), (see fig. 5, column 3, lines 1-18). Kramer et al fail to disclose the sensor. Hirabayashi et al disclose a sensor (16-4). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art to modify Kramer et al to include a sensor (16-4) as disclosed by Hirabayashi et al to improve and detect the electrical response corresponding to the position of the monitor beam detected by the position sensor (16-4), (see fig. 16, column 16, lines 36-45).

Claims 21 and 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer et al in view of Hirabayashi et al and further in view of Gipson et al (4,732,446).

As to claim 21, Kramer et al disclose a detection system with first and second optical interfaces, terminal windows (158) transparent to the wavelength, housing sections (152) transparent to wavelength, (see fig. 12). Kramer et al fail to disclose terminal adapters. Gipson et al disclose terminal adapter (60), (see fig. 14). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art to modify Kramer et al to include terminal adapter (60) as disclosed by Gipson et al to improve and secure tightly the connection of the fiber optic cable (68) interfacing with optic fibers (16) allowing bidirectional transmission of data, (see fig. 14, column 9, lines 42-49).

As to claim 29, Kramer et al disclose a detection system having optical interfaces and light guide output (50), (52), (54), (56), and (58), (see fig. 5, column 3, lines 1-18).

Kramer et al fail to disclose an adapter unit. Gipson et al disclose an adapter unit (60). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art to modify Kramer et al to include an adapter unit (60) to improve the optical connection of the data bus allowing fast transmission of data, (see fig. 14, column 9, lines 42-49).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Don Williams whose telephone number is 571-272-8538. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30a.m. to 5:30a.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Porta can be reached on 571-272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Don Williams
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2878
Ph #: 571-272-8538

DAVID PORTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800